

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 9 continue to be under consideration.

Claim 10 is being cancelled..

The Office Action refers to *Claim Objections*

Claim 1-9 stand objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1:

Line 3. "a rewind core may be" should be -a rewind core--;

Lines 9-10, "a pressure contact roller which may be positioned" should be -a pressure contact roller positioned--;

Line 10, "a core" should be -the core--

In claim 2:

Line 3, "a contact roller" should be -the contact roller--.

In claim 3:

Lines 3-4, "a contact roller" should be -the contact roller--.

In claim 6:

Line 3, "a core shaft" should be -the core shaft--.

Appropriate corrections are required.

The present amendment modifies claims 1, 2, 3, and 6 to obviate the objections.

*The Office Action refers to Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112.*

Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.

The present amendment cancels claim 10.

Claim 1 is indefinite and vague. Examples are listed below;

The phrase, "a slitter rewinder machine of the kind having a base supporting two," is indefinite and vague. What constitutes the term "the kind"?

The phrase, "the machine base in a manner permitting traversing and adjustment of the spacing," is indefinite and vague. What constitutes the term "manner"?

Claim 5 is indefinite and vague. The phrase, "each bearing assembly has a maximum circumferential dimension less than the diameter of a relevant core," is indefinite and vague. What constitutes the term "a relevant core"?

The present amendment changes the language of claims 1 and 5 to overcome the rejections expressed in the Office Action.

*The Office Action refers to Allowable Subject Matter.*

Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action

Claims 2-9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The claims are patentable over the prior art of record because the teachings of the references taken as a whole do not show or render obvious the combination set forth in claim 1, including all the structural elements recited in the claim, especially, each arm having support bearings and a core driving shaft for coupling with a core engaging and locking chuck, wherein the core shaft and support bearings engaging a first core internal diameter at one end of the shaft and other end of the shaft engaging a second core internal diameter. The Prior art U.S. Patent '145 has L-brackets adjustable to hold spools at each end, but it lacks the drive shaft that can engage each internal diameter of the spool. The Prior art taken as a whole fails to disclose or render obvious the presently claimed invention.

Applicant sincerely appreciates the finding of allowable subject matter as well as the reasoning stated as to why these claims are allowable.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Entry of the present response is respectfully requested. All claims as submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Kevin P. Windo

By: *Horst M. Kasper*  
Horst M. Kasper, his attorney  
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059  
Tel.: (908)526-1717; Reg. No. 28559  
Attorney's Docket No.: KIN216

/rep/am/sn-